

Remarks

1. Claim Status

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-12, 14-23, 25-28, and 30-34, 36-37, 39-40, 44-48 remain pending.

Claims 1, 12, 23, 28, and 33 are independent.

2. § 112

The Office Action rejected claim 37, 40, 45, and 48 under § 112. As an illustrative claim, claim 37 recites:

"writing a second completion status to a memory address external to a second descriptor occurs prior to writing a first completion status to a memory external to a first descriptor; and

wherein execution of a command in the first descriptor is initiated before execution of a command in the second descriptor is initiated"

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. To illustrate, FIG. 4 depicts stacked memory locations 42 that can be executed in order (paragraph [0023]). As shown, execution of a first descriptor (COMMAND A1) is initiated before a second descriptor (COMMAND B1). The specification also describes that the order of that the

completion status is indicated is different than the order in which commands are issued (see, e.g., paragraph [0024], originally filed claim 1). Thus, if the completions status indicated by COMMAND A1 and COMMAND B1 are different than the order in which they are issued, the completion status of COMMAND B1 is indicated prior to indicating a completion status for COMMAND A1.

3. Prior Art Rejections

To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of previously pending claim 35 ("wherein at least some of the descriptors comprise commands executed by one of multiple encryption units implementing different respective encryption algorithms").

The Office Action rejected claim 35 based on a combination of references including Kusakabe (U.S. 6,073,236). In particular, the Office Action states that Kusakabe features multiple encryption units implementing different respective encryption algorithms. Applicant disagrees. FIG. 6, relied upon in the rejection, depicts a single encryption section 82, not multiple encryption units, let alone multiple encryption units implementing different respective algorithms. Applicant, thus, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 as amended.

Applicant has similarly amended independent claims 12, 23, 28, and 33. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of the pending independent claims and their corresponding dependent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/18/07

/Robert A. Greenberg/

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778